DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 629 SP 001 856

By- Shawver, David

What Kind of Teachers for the New Curriculum.

Pub Date Jun 65

Note- 8p.; Presented at the conference honoring Florence B. Stratemeyer, French Lick, Indiana, June 10-12, 1965.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.50

Descriptors- Cognitive Development, *Curriculum Development, *Educational Objectives, *Educational Trends, *Social Values, Teacher Education, *Teacher Education Curriculum, Teaching Quality

With increasing subject matter specialization in secondary and elementary schools (particularly in mathematics and the sciences), it is necessary to include curriculum and course objectives related to the affective domain (social values) as well as those related to the cognitive domain. Subject matter is made meaningful to a student when related to his own life and culture. Therefore, current trends in education must be carefully assessed. Teacher educators must "appraise intelligently" their society and "consider anew what is both quality education for children and quality preparation for teachers of these children." Much teaching "is still carried out in a social situation of instructors and students" which can provide "the kinds of human relationships conducive to quality education." (A 9-item bibliography is included.) (SG)

EDO 24629

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

WHAT KIND OF TEACHERS FOR THE NEW CURRICULUM

David Shawver

Presented at the Conference Honoring

Florence B. Stratemeyer

French Lick, Indiana, June 10-12, 1965

SP001856

WHAT KIND OF TEACHERS FOR THE NEW CURRICULA?*

David Shawver
Associate Professor of Education
Washington State University

What is the present image of the good teacher? Do current programs of reorganizing the academic subjects bring with them a new ideal of what the good teacher is or does? What does the shift from individual or social problems back to the individual disciplines as the organizing focus for content do to theories of teacher education?

At first glance it might seem that many teacher educators have been working toward developing a different breed of teachers from that currently in demand. A closer look at the situation leads me to believe that while current efforts to reorganize courses in the academic disciplines do have great significance for teacher education, the cause that many of us have championed is not lost. Many things being said about the types of teachers needed for newly reorganized courses can be most enthusiastically received by those of us who are interested in using personal or social problems as the organizing focus in general education.

What is the role of the teacher in the new courses? For example, what is his role in SMSG math, BSCS biology, or PSSC physics? Fortunately, leaders in these programs have had quite a bit to say about the role of the teacher in the instructional process, and what they say is in some respects astonishingly similar to what teacher educators have been saying since the 1930's. It would be difficult to determine whether it is a proponent of a core program or of one of the newly organized courses in science speaking when he begins talking about the role of the teacher or student in the instructional process.

Tell me who might have said this: "The student is expected to be an active participant in the course." No doubt thousands of teacher educators have said this from 1935 to the present. Yet this is a direct quote explaining the role of the student in the PSSC course in physics.[1/] Or take another example: "It appears that the teachers in the program tend to change their classroom behavior to a less authoritarian one. Independent thinking on the part of the student is encouraged and a good deal of student initiative is developed."[2/] This is a comment made in reference to the chemical bond approach to teaching chemistry. Yet a third example: "An education based on facts alone is not sufficient." A few lines later the author of this statement says, "To reach intelligent decisions, the student must have or be able

---

*Paper prepared for the Conference Honoring Florence B. Stratemeyer, French Lick, Indiana, June 10-12, 1965.

1/ Gilbert C. Finlay, "The Physical Science Study Committee," Modern Viewpoints in the Curriculum. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1964. p. 39.

2/ Laurence E. Strong, "A Possible Approach to High School Chemistry," op. cit., p. 98.

to find /emphasis added/ the appropriate information required as the basis for reasoned conclusions and must know how to use it." This has a familiar ring? It is the kind of educational theorizing that has been familiar to teacher educators for many years. It is an idea which the most avid exponents of an experience-centered curriculum might have espoused. Yet it was said in the Journal of Medical Educatinn in an article with the intriguing title, "The Threshold of a Revolution in Biological Education."3/ Another quotation is taken from the forward of the book, Modern Viewpoints in the Curriculum: "Our main effort, therefore, must be directed toward teaching the child how to learn new things and toward giving him the desire to keep on learning all his life." While admittedly this statement only establishes an aim for teachers and does not define the role for them that will help them reach the goal, it is certainly not a new idea nor foreign to the way many of us have been thinking about teaching for many years.

At times teacher educators feel miffed that people working with the newly reorganized separate disciplines are being listened to by the public, when we believe that they say some of the same things that many of us said years ago (and quite often we talked only to each other). However, if experts in curriculum and teaching had not been saying such things for years, it might be questionable whether we would be hearing them from a variety of sources today. Let me hasten to state that I am not advocating that teacher educators develop a bandwagon attitude toward new innovations in the curriculum and merely attempt to catch on to the coat tails of every change that may be taking place in education. What I am saying is that in some respects, we are finally getting through to the subject matter specialists who are now taking an active part in curriculum developments.

Despite legitimate optimism about some aspects of reorganization, there are also certain important cautions. In the current enthusiasm to upgrade the knowledge of the teacher in the academic disciplines, it is easy to lose sight of other dimensions of education which are necessary if the future teacher is to be most effective in helping young people develop into the kinds of individuals society needs and to reach the high degrees of self-realization. The goals related to learning a discipline are often not broad enough guides for teachers at any level--elementary, secondary, or college. The goals must have a functional relationship to the life we lead and to the society in which we live. The understanding of the structure of a discipline (so often emphasized by the reorganizers) is not an end in itself, but only a means to achieve broader social objectives consistent with our value system.

Current efforts to reorganize the content and method in the teaching of the academic disciplines have not, in most cases, gone beyond statements of objectives which are specifically subject oriented. The teacher educator needs to be aware that the sum of all objectives mentioned by the reorganizers of academic disciplines does not represent the total range of objectives to which education in America has generally been committed. Teacher educators must take the responsibility to see that future teachers do not lose sight of this broader spectrum of objectives.

3/Arnold B. Grobman, "The Threshold of a Revolution in Biological Education," op. cit., p. 129.

Since much of the current work in reorganizing courses is in mathematics and the sciences, it is only natural that a greater portion of the objectives listed for these courses has fallen into the cognitive domain. Relatively little in these reorganized courses is specifically concerned with objectives that involve social values (objectives which would largely be in the affective domain). However, educators must keep in mind that, in the long run, public education will be called to account just as surely for its success or failure in teaching students values that benefit society, as it will be for its success or failure in reaching objectives related to remembering or the solving of some intellectual task.

The writers of the current projects have seemingly failed to consider that a high degree of insight into a discipline does not automatically develop attitudes in students which will cause them to use the discipline for the good of either themselves or society. As noted by Krathwohl, "...much of the research on the relation between cognitive achievement and attitudes and values shows them to be statistically independent."[4]

It is necessary for teachers in any subject area to be concerned with outcomes in the affective domain, including those "which emphasize a feeling tone, an emotion or a degree of acceptance or rejection."[5] Before the current reorganization efforts became popular it would have been difficult to pick up a book devoted to school curriculum which did not give considerable space to objectives falling within the affective domain. True, at times the objectives were sometimes vague, and perhaps even unrealistic, but they did represent a conviction on the part of educators that the schools' job was a broad one involving a concern for the total development of the individual. Today, you may often search in vain in the new project statements for any indication that the writers recognize any obligation of teachers to teach values. Even the National Education Association's Project on Instruction materials seem to imply that values are the concern almost entirely of the humanities area of the curriculum.[6] On the other hand, the view many curriculum workers have held for years is expressed in the statement by Morse that "...to be effectively developed, they (values) must be part of the warp and woof of the total educational endeavor, extracurricular as well as curricular."[7]

While it is valid to criticize the new programs for their lack of emphasis on affective objectives, it must also be recognized that the writers of the new programs do have hopes of achieving some objectives in this domain.

---

[4] David R. Krathwohl and others. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Company, 1964. p. 7.

[5] Ibid. p. 7.

[6] National Education Association, Project on the Instructional Program of the Public Schools. Deciding What to Teach. Washington, D. C.: the Project, 1963. p. 110.

[7] H. T. Morse, "Between the Ivory Tower and the Market Place," Junior College Journal, Volume XXX, No. 7, April, 1965. p. 20.

They indicate that they wish to develop an interest in their subject and hope that a certain attitude towards learning and the value of learning be acquired by students. Such statements, however, are of a general nature, and are often implied rather than stated when it comes to writing curriculum guides. Again, the cognitive objectives are the focus.

The authors of the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives make it clear that dividing educational objectives into cognitive and affective domains is somewhat misleading because the two categories of objectives are often not achieved independently from one another. Nevertheless, the same authors point out the necessity for special concern for the affective objectives on the part of educators. The possible consequences of assuming that you need not be overly concerned with planning learning experiences to meet affective objectives as long as you are doing a good job achieving cognitive objectives are pointed out in the following statement:

> The writers are persuaded that, although there may be varying relations between cognitive and affective objectives, the particular relations in any situation are determined by the learning experiences the students have had. Thus one set of learning experiences may produce a high level of cognitive achievement at the same time that it produces an actual distate for the subject. Another set of learning experiences may produce a high level of cognitive achievement as well as great interest and liking for the subject.[8]

Admittedly, educators have often done an abysmally poor job of stating the whole range of objectives in a way that was functional in directing their learning activities. Also, admittedly, educators are still neophytes in acquiring insight into how to achieve all of the lofty affective objectives they have stated over the years. However, the way to improve the situation is not to stick our heads in the sand and pretend the problems no longer exist. Our task must be to make new, determined, and sophisticated efforts to find ways in which learning objectives in the affective domain can be clearly and functionally stated and achieved.

A compelling challenge to the schools to seriously consider the affective objectives appears in the following statement:

> Some would question the desirability of a schools' considering affective objectives. Some would wonder about the wisdom of making these objectives explicit rather than implicit, and more would doubt the possibility of the schools doing anything significant to develop affective objectives. If we obscure the objectives in the affective domain and bury them in platitudes how can we examine them, determine their meaning, or do anything constructive about them? Our 'box' (Pandora's) must be opened if we are to face reality and take action.

8/ David R. Krathwohl and other, op. cit., p. 86.

> It is this 'box' that the most influential controls are to be found. The affective domain contains the forces that determine the nature of an individual's life and ultimately the life of an entire people. To keep the 'box' closed is to deny the existence of the powerful motivational forces that shape the life of each of us. To look the other way is to avoid coming to terms with the real.9/

The moral education of youngsters presents a problem that certainly seems to find no important place in the deliberation of writers of the new projects. Yet, moral education is still a very obvious necessity. As an editorial in a recent issue of Phi Delta Kappan10/ pointed out, it is doubtful that teachers can avoid much longer the issue of moral education. The cliche "morality is caught, not taught" is not likely to satisfy serious educators who look at the changing values of our culture.

The ability to synthesize will be of great importance for the new generation of teachers who will teach the new curricula. How can teachers operating in a highly specialized fashion combine the various learning activities of the school into a meaningful whole for the student? The current stress on greater and greater sophistication in a single academic discipline for teachers at not only the high school level but also well down into the elementary school may make it increasingly difficult for the teacher to acquire the breadth of education necessary to relate the various disciplines in a functional way to the real needs of children and youth. Specialization within a discipline is pushed even further by the current emphasis on team teaching. We divide and divide and specialize and specialize, but how do we unite and synthesize teacher efforts and student learning experiences? Can phalanxes of specialists in our schools provide the proper kind of help for students in integrating their experiences? The past history of separate disciplines leads us to doubt whether further specialization of teachers will succeed in this respect. Already many people have heralded the death of the self-contained elementary classroom. The question is still undecided as to whether this represents progress.

The era of teacher specialization will result in a new era of subject fragmentation unless the schools and teacher educators are very careful in their planning. Extensive demands will be made on teachers to work more closely with each other than they ever have before. This, in turn, means that new emphasis in teacher education will need to be given to developing the ability of prospective teachers to work successfully with others.

We must never lose sight of other points which have been debated in the past. Are we now convinced that the logic of the specialists as they approach a discipline is always similar to the logic of the neophyte as he approaches a discipline? An individual who is thoroughly at home

---

9/ Ibid, p. 91.

10/ Stanley Elam, "Toward New Guiding Rules of Behavior," Phi Delta Kappan, Volume XLVI, No. 2, October 1964. p. 41.

in a discipline knows the important framework of the discipline to which he can relate specific details. He can approach the discipline systematically with this structure in mind. The study of the discipline by the expert in that discipline needs no tie-in with immediate practical concerns of the world in order to make such study meaningful and motivating. On the other hand the students' approach to the discipline seems often to be a groping affair, wherein a detail of minor consequences to the structure of the discipline may furnish the motivational hand-hold that brings the student his first meaningful introduction to the discipline.

An important spur to a conscious effort to learn about something is an understanding on the part of the student that the material has some meaning and pertinence to him. Problem centered approaches which deal with personal or social problems are easily interpreted by the student as being relevant to him. As the new projects turn to problems within the discipline as organizing foci, will the student be effectively and intrinsically motivated? Can the challenge of knowing the structure of the discipline substitute for the motivation engendered by a student's perception that the content has immediate relevance to his own problems or those of his culture? Such questions must not be relegated to the shelves. They are still vital questions for curriculum people and teacher educators.

What we need to do now is to assess carefully current trends in education, whether they are or are not of our making. Let us accept neither a "me too" attitude toward innovations nor an attitude of "it will never work" toward ideas which may be new to us. Let us do what we have been claiming we have always done--appraise intelligently the society in which we live; study diligently to understand children and youth and how they learn; re-dedicate ourselves to a value structure compatible with democracy. From the background of these foundations of education we may consider anew what is both quality education for children and quality preparation for teachers of these children. With this approach we can cut through a mass of irrelevancies concerning the teaching role.

One thing is certain: A great amount of teaching is still carried out in a social situation of instructor and students. The kinds of human relationships that are conducive to quality education are not open to serious debate. None of us, I am sure, will ever forget the kind of warmth and regard for individuals that characterized the staff with whom we worked at Teachers College (and I stress <u>with whom</u> we worked rather than <u>under whom</u> we worked). We will not soon forget the value system we experienced. In turn, if we can let our students in teacher education experience these values, we will have taken a most important step in improving student teaching.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bloom, Benjamin S. (ed.) Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Cognitive Domain. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1956.

Bruner, Jerome S. The Process of Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Caswell, Hollis L. and Doak S. Campbell. Readings in Curriculum Development. New York: American Book Company, 1937.

Cyphert, Frederick R. et al (ed.) Teaching in the American Secondary School, Selected Readings. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

Elam, Stanley, "Toward New Guiding Rules of Behavior," Phi Delta Kappan, Volume XLVI, No. 2, October, 1964.

Goodlad, John I. School Curriculum Reform in the United States. New York: David McKay Company, 1964.

Krathwohl, David R., Bloom, Benjamin S. and Betram B. Masia. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Company, 1964.

National Education Association, Project on the Instructional Program of the Public Schools. Deciding What to Teach. Washington, D. C.: the Project, 1963.

Rosebloom, Paul C. (ed.) Modern Viewpoints in the Curriculum. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1964.